UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/813,644	03/29/2004	Kelly Rollin	MSFT122019	4949

26389 7590 08/01/2007

CHRISTENSEN, O'CONNOR, JOHNSON, KINDNESS, PLLC
1420 FIFTH AVENUE
SUITE 2800
SEATTLE, WA 98101-2347

EXAMINER	
ORR, HENRY W	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/01/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/813,644	ROLLIN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Henry Orr	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *15 June 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *43-78* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *43-78* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *3/29/2004* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to applicant's amendment dated 6/15/2007.

2. Claims 43-78 are pending in the case.

3. Claims 1-42 are cancelled.

4. Claims 43-78 are newly added.

5. Claims 43, 60, 72 and 74 are independent claims.

Applicant's Response

6. In Applicant's response dated 6/15/2007, applicant has cancelled claims 1-42, therefore, due to the cancellation of the claims, the objections and rejections previously set forth in Office Action dated 2/5/2007 are obviated:

Drawings

7. Figure 1 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

8. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

9. Claims 60-73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The language of the claims raises a question as to whether the claims are directed merely to abstract ideas that are not tied to a technological art, environment, or machine which would result in a practical application producing a concrete, useful, and tangible result to form the basis of statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101. See MPEP § 2106

Claim 60:

Claim 60 recites a **"system"** comprising a **"device selection user interface"**, **"function discovery database"**, **"programming interface"** and a **"data processing component"**. The recited **"system"** is merely computer software that performs various functions. Thus, the recited **"system"** is comprised merely of computer software and is not a process, a machine, a manufacture or a composition of matter.

Accordingly, the claim fails to recite statutory subject matter as defined in 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Claims 61-71:

Dependent claims 61-71 are rejected for fully incorporating the deficiencies of base claim 60.

Claim 72:

Claim 72 recites a **"computer-readable medium"** comprising a **"device selection user interface"**, **"programming interface"** and a **"data processing component"**. The recited **"computer-readable medium"** is merely computer software that performs various functions. Thus, the recited **"computer-readable medium"** is comprised merely of computer software and is not a process, a machine, a manufacture or a composition of matter.

Accordingly, the claim fails to recite statutory subject matter as defined in 35 U.S.C. § 101.

To overcome the rejection, Examiner suggests to applicant to amend the claim 72 to the following: *A computer-readable medium ~~having~~ storing executable computer-readable components for presenting device information in a unified and consistent way and for accessing and manipulating device information for user selected devices, the ~~computer-readable medium~~ executable computer-readable components comprising:*

Claim 73:

Dependent claim 73 is rejected for fully incorporating the deficiencies of base claim 72.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

10. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

11. **Claims 49-57 and 60-78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.**

Claim 49:

Claim 49 recites: *"creating information for a first segment of code, the information received from the common dialog object; and communicating the information for the first segment of code to a second segment of code in the function discovery database to access functionality provided by the second segment of code."*

There is no mention of the newly amended limitation in the original Specification. Thus, the limitations include subject matter that was not described in the original Specification.

If the examiner has overlooked the portion of the original Specification that describes this feature of the present invention, then Applicant should point it out (by page number and line number) in the response to this Office Action.

Applicant may obviate this rejection by canceling the claim.

Claims 60 and 72:

Claims 60 and 72 recite: *"a data processing component having an executable component".*

There is no mention of the newly amended limitation in the original Specification. Thus, the limitations include subject matter that was not described in the original Specification.

If the examiner has overlooked the portion of the original Specification that describes this feature of the present invention, then Applicant should point it out (by page number and line number) in the response to this Office Action.

Applicant may obviate this rejection by canceling the claim.

Claim 68:

Claim 68 recites: *"a first code segment on the common dialog object; and a second code segment on the function discovery database; wherein, when executed, the data processing component having the executable component communicates information through the first code segment to the second code segment. "*

There is no mention of the newly amended limitation in the original Specification. Thus, the limitations include subject matter that was not described in the original Specification.

If the examiner has overlooked the portion of the original Specification that describes this feature of the present invention, then Applicant should point it out (by page number and line number) in the response to this Office Action.

Applicant may obviate this rejection by canceling the claim.

Claim 74:

Claim 74 recites: *"receiving information from the common dialog object through a first segment of code on the programming interface; and accessing enumerated information on a function discovery database, the information being communicated through the first segment of code to a second segment of code".*

There is no mention of the newly amended limitation in the original Specification. Thus, the limitations include subject matter that was not described in the original Specification.

If the examiner has overlooked the portion of the original Specification that describes this feature of the present invention, then Applicant should point it out (by page number and line number) in the response to this Office Action.

Applicant may obviate this rejection by canceling the claim.

Claim 78:

Claim 78 recites: *"rewriting functionality within the function discovery database".*

There is no mention of the newly amended limitation in the original Specification. Thus, the limitations include subject matter that was not described in the original Specification.

If the examiner has overlooked the portion of the original Specification that describes this feature of the present invention, then Applicant should point it out (by page number and line number) in the response to this Office Action.

Applicant may obviate this rejection by canceling the claim.

Claims 50-57, 61-71, 73 and 75-78:

Dependent claims 50-57, 61-71, 73 and 75-78 are rejected for fully incorporating the deficiencies of their respective base claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

12. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

13. Claims 74-78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 74 recites **"a method for providing information in a unified and consistent way to a common dialog object through a programming interface"** in

the preamble. However, the body of the claim is silent on the required steps to arrive with **"providing information in a unified and consistent way to a common dialog object"**, therefore rendering the claim as indefinite.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

14. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

15. **Claims 43-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Strittmatter et al. (hereinafter "Strittmatter"), U.S. Published Application No. 2004/0176118 A1.**

Claim 43:

Strittmatter teaches **a method for device selection in a computer system, the method comprising: creating a common dialog object** (see abstract, par. 80, par. 83, Figure 1).

Strittmatter teaches **obtaining device information to be displayed within the common dialog object by accessing enumerated device information contained in a function discovery database** (see par. 55-56, par. 80, par. 83, Figure 5; ref. #505).

Strittmatter teaches **displaying the common dialog object with the obtained device information** (see par. 80, par. 83, Figure 14).

Strittmatter teaches **receiving a user selection from the displayed common dialog object** (see par. 80, par. 83).

Strittmatter teaches **returning a reference to a device, which is identified based on the user selection by accessing the enumerated device information contained in the function discovery database** (see par. 37, par. 56-58).

Claim 44:

Strittmatter teaches **wherein obtaining device information to be displayed within the common dialog object comprises filtering device information obtained from the function discovery database** (see par. 48, par. 66-69).

Claim 45:

Strittmatter teaches **wherein filtering device information obtained from the function discovery database is specified by a caller** (see par. 41, par. 68, par. 80).

Claim 46:

Strittmatter teaches **wherein filtering device information obtained from the function discovery database is specified by a user** (see par. 41, par. 68, par. 80).

Claim 47:

Strittmatter teaches **wherein filtering device information obtained from the function discovery database is specified by a selected parameter** (see par. 80-83).

Claim 48:

Strittmatter teaches **accessing the enumerated device information contained in the function discovery database comprises using a programming interface** (see par. 32 par. 70, Figure 1; ref. #115).

Claim 49:

Strittmatter teaches **wherein using a programming interface comprises: creating information for a first segment of code, the information received from the common dialog object; and communicating the information for the first segment of code to a second segment of code in the function discovery database to access functionality provided by the second segment of code** (see par. 32 par. 70, Figure 1; ref. #115).

Claim 50:

Strittmatter teaches **wherein communicating the information for the first segment of code to the second segment of code comprises communicating through a medium** (see par. 1).

Claim 51:

Strittmatter teaches **wherein communicating the information for the first segment of code to the second segment of code comprises dividing the communication into multiple discrete communications** (see par. 26, par. 28).

Claim 52:

Strittmatter teaches **wherein the multiple discrete communications are divided into divisible sets of functionality** (see par. 29, par. 40).

Claim 53:

Strittmatter teaches **wherein communicating the information for the first segment of code to the second segment of code comprises redefining the communication by ignoring at least one or more parameters** (see par. 65, par. 75, par. 80).

Claim 54:

Strittmatter teaches **wherein communicating the information for the first segment of code to the second segment of code comprises using one or more pieces of middleware to convert the communications of the first code segment to a second code segment** (see par. 34-37).

Claim 55:

Strittmatter teaches **wherein communicating the information for the first segment of code to the second segment of code comprises rewriting functionality** (see par. 79, par. 94, par. 98-99).

Claim 56:

Strittmatter teaches **wherein each segment of code includes at least one of a module, object, subroutine, and function** (see par. 29).

Claim 57:

Strittmatter teaches **wherein each segment of code includes at least one of a source code, intermediate code, or object code** (see par. 29, par. 40, par. 50 par. 104.)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

16. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

17. Claims 58-78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Strittmatter as cited above, in view of Chiloyan et al. (hereinafter "Chiloyan"), U.S. Published Application No. 2002/0083228.

Claims 58 and 59:

Regarding claims 58 and 59, Strittmatter fails to expressly teach determining whether an actionable function on a device within a user interface has been selected includes determining that a right-click has been performed.

However, Chiloyan teaches *"The user clicks on an icon representing the desired peripheral device at a step 172 and selects an option to view the properties of that peripheral device"* (see par. 53). **(claim 58; i.e., wherein receiving a user selection from the displayed common dialog object comprises determining whether an actionable function on a device within a user interface has been selected) (claim 59; i.e., wherein determining whether an actionable function on a device within a user interface has been selected includes determining that a right-click has been performed.)** Examiner interprets pointing device that the user uses to click the chosen device as right-clicked actionable because in Windows 2000 the right mouse button lets you view the properties of a file, folder or other object.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the devices displayed in the filtered list as taught by Strittmatter to include a properties sheet as taught by Chiloyan to provide the benefit of viewing additional details or attributes of the device. Thus, the user can easily determine a desired imaging device based on the device capabilities to process an imaging request (see Chiloyan; par. 53) (see Strittmatter; par. 81, par. 86, par. 89).

Claim 60:

Strittmatter teaches **a system for accessing and manipulating device information for user selected desired devices, wherein the device information is presented in a unified way** (see abstract, Figure 14).

Strittmatter fails to expressly teach a device selection user interface having actionable icons for a set of devices.

However, Chiloyan teaches *"The user clicks on an icon representing the desired peripheral device at a step 172 and selects an option to view the properties of that peripheral device"* (see par. 53). **(claim 60; i.e., a device selection user interface having actionable icons for a set of devices)**

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the devices displayed in the filtered list as taught by Strittmatter to include a properties sheet as taught by Chiloyan to provide the benefit of viewing additional details or attributes of the device. Thus, the user can easily determine

a desired imaging device based on the device capabilities to process an imaging request (see Chiloyan; par. 53) (see Strittmatter; par. 81, par. 86, par. 89).

Strittmatter teaches **a function discovery database having enumerated device information corresponding to the set of devices** (see par. 55-56, par. 80, par. 83, Figure 5; ref. #505).

Strittmatter teaches **a programming interface corresponding to the device selection user interface for interacting with the function discovery database** (see par. 32 par. 70, Figure 1; ref. #115).

Strittmatter teaches a common dialog object on the user interface (see par. 80, par. 83, Figure 14).

Strittmatter fails to expressly teach a common dialog object on the user interface having actionable icons for the set of devices.

However, Chiloyan teaches a device manager with actionable icons for a set of peripheral devices (see par. 53). **(claim 60; i.e., a data processing component having an executable component, which, when executed: a common dialog object on the user interface having actionable icons for the set of devices)**

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the devices displayed in the common dialog object on the user interface as taught by Strittmatter to include actionable icons as taught by Chiloyan to provide the benefit of viewing additional details or attributes of the device. Thus, the

user can easily determine a desired imaging device based on the device capabilities to process an imaging request (see Chiloyan; par. 53) (see Strittmatter; par. 81, par. 86, par. 89).

Strittmatter teaches **obtains device information to be displayed within the common dialog object by accessing enumerated device information contained in the function discovery database through the programming interface** (see par. 32 par. 70, Figure 1; ref. #115).

Strittmatter teaches **displays the common dialog object with the obtained device information; receives a user selection from the displayed common dialog object; and returns a reference to a device which is identified based on the user selection by accessing the enumerated device information contained in the function discovery database through the programming interface** (see par. 37, par. 56-58, par. 80, par. 83, Figure 14).

Claim 61:

Strittmatter teaches a filtering component for selecting a subset of the devices that are returned to the common dialog object (see par. 41, par. 68, par. 80, Figure 3; ref. #315).

Claims 62 and 63:

Regarding claims 62 and 63, Strittmatter fails to expressly teach actionable

function icons having a click option such as a right-click option for displaying device information.

However, Chiloyan teaches *"The user clicks on an icon representing the desired peripheral device at a step 172 and selects an option to view the properties of that peripheral device"* (see par. 53). **(claim 62; i.e., wherein the actionable icons for the set of devices have a click option for displaying device information) (claim 63; i.e., wherein the actionable icons for the set of devices have a right-click option for displaying device information)** Examiner interprets pointing device that the user uses to click the chosen device as right-clicked actionable because in Windows 2000 the right mouse button lets you view the properties of a file, folder or other object.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the devices displayed in the filtered list as taught by Strittmatter to include actionable icons with click options as taught by Chiloyan to provide the benefit of viewing additional details or attributes of the device. Thus, the user can easily determine a desired imaging device based on the device capabilities to process an imaging request (see Chiloyan; par. 53) (see Strittmatter; par. 81, par. 86, par. 89).

Claim 64:

Strittmatter's Figure 14 illustrates **wherein the device selection user interface includes descriptions of the set of devices.**

Claims 65-67:

Strittmatter teaches a device selection user interface for wireless devices (see Figure 14).

Strittmatter fails to expressly teach a device selection user interface that has actionable buttons wireless peripheral devices such as a mouse or keyboard.

Strittmatter also fails to expressly teach a device selection user interface that has a control bar.

However, Chiloyan teaches a device manager with actionable icons representing wireless peripheral devices such a pointing device ("mouse") or keyboard and tabs ("control bar") to display various pages of properties pertaining to the devices. **(claim 65; wherein the device selection user interface has an actionable button for a mouse.) (claim 66; i.e., wherein the device selection user interface has an actionable button for a keyboard.) (claim 67; i.e., wherein the device selection user interface has a control bar.)**

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the wireless devices displayed as taught by Strittmatter to include actionable icons representing wireless peripheral devices as taught by Chiloyan to provide the benefit of viewing additional details or attributes of the wireless devices (see Chiloyan; par.30-32, par. 36, par. 53).

Claim 68:

Strittmatter teaches **wherein the programming interface corresponding to the device selection user interface for interacting with the function discovery database comprises: a first code segment on the common dialog object; and a second code segment on the function discovery database; wherein, when executed, the data processing component having the executable component communicates information through the first code segment to the second code segment** (see par. 32 par. 70, Figure 1; ref. #115).

Claim 69:

Strittmatter teaches **wherein the information being communicated through the first code segment to the second code segment is separated into multiple discrete communications** (see par. 26, par. 28).

Claim 70:

Strittmatter teaches **wherein the multiple discrete communications are divided into divisible sets of functionality** (see par. 29, par. 40).

Claim 71:

Strittmatter teaches comprising one or more pieces of middleware to convert the information being communicated through the first code segment to the second code segment (see par. 34-37).

Claim 72:

Claim 72 includes a program embodied on a computer readable medium to implement the steps that are substantially encompassed in system claim 60; therefore the claim is rejected under the same rationale as system claim 60 above.

Claim 73:

Strittmatter teaches **a filtering component and an enumeration component, wherein the enumeration component retrieves all relevant device information in the function discovery database and the filtering component allows an application to select a subset of the device information that is returned by the enumeration component** (see par. 55-56, par. 80-83, Figure 3; ref. #310, ref. #315).

Claims 74-78:

Claims 74-78 are method claims and are substantially encompassed in method claims 49, 51, 53 and 55 respectively; therefore the methods claims are rejected under the same rationale as method claims 49, 51, 53 and 55 above.

Response to Arguments

18. Applicant's arguments filed 6/15/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

35 U.S.C. 102(e) Rejections

In respect to independent claims 46, 60, 72 and 74, Applicant argues Strittmatter fails to teach or suggest enumerated device information contained in a function discovery database. Similarly, Strittmatter does not contemplate a function discovery database having enumerated device information, but instead Strittmatter retrieves enumerated device information from the devices themselves (see Applicant Response; p. 9 last full paragraph thru p. 10).

Examiner disagrees.

Strittmatter teaches a database structure that contains previously discovered device information that serves as a "function discovery database" (see par. 55-56, Figure 5; ref. #505). Therefore, after Strittmatter retrieves enumerated device information from the devices themselves, Strittmatter stores the enumerated device information in a *"function discovery database"* to speed up the process of searching for the same device information in the future (see par. 55).

Conclusion

19. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Henry Orr whose telephone number is (571) 270 1308. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 8 to 4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton can be reached on (571) 272-4137. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

7/30/2007
HO

/Doug Hutton/
Supervisory Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2176